



## **Executive Committee Meeting June 28, 2001 Draft - Meeting Summary**

*The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.*

### **Executive Committee members present:**

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Kargianis<br>Chair             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob McKenna<br>Vice-Chair, King County | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Hughes<br>FHWA                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Santos Contreras (Alt.)<br>City of Kirkland      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sen. Horn<br>WA State Senate           | <input type="checkbox"/> Harold Taniguchi (Alt.)<br>King County     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie Marshall<br>City of Bellevue   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Edwards<br>PSRC                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Randy Corman<br>City of Renton  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Okamoto<br>WSDOT                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rosemarie Ives<br>City of Redmond      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Mullet<br>City of Tukwila |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dick Paylor (Alt.)<br>City of Bothell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan McBride<br>City of Kirkland       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grant Degginger (Alt.)<br>City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonny Putter<br>City of Newcastle     | <input type="checkbox"/> Pam Carter (Alt.)<br>City of Tukwila              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aubrey Davis (Alt.)<br>WSTC     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> David Dye (Alt.)<br>WSDOT                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Cothorn<br>Snohomish County    | <input type="checkbox"/> Dave Somers<br>Snohomish County            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cheryl Pflug<br>WA State House of Reps.     | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Christopher Hurst<br>WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Margarita Prentice<br>WA State Senate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Julia Peterson (Alt.)<br>WA State Senate    |  |   |

### **Staff and Observers**

Johannes Kurz, Snohomish County  
Bruce Nurse, Kemper Development  
Chris Johnson, KC Council

Kim Becklund, Bellevue

### **Project Management Team**

Mike Cummings, WSDOT  
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates  
Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental  
Ron Anderson, DEA  
Phil Fordyce, WSDOT

Paul Bergman, PRR  
Brian O'Sullivan- Sound Transit  
Ann Martin, King County  
Melanie Moores, WSDOT

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Kargianis called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and reviewed the meeting's agenda:

- Program Update
  - Schedule Update
  - Funding and Phasing Update
  - Outreach Working Group Update
- BNSF Right-of-Way Preservation
  - Steering Committee Recommendation and Citizen Committee Feedback
- Preliminary Preferred Alternative – Transit, TDM, Central Eastside HCT Elements
  - Review Elements and Rationale
  - System and Community Level Issues Identified
  - Discussion on System Level Issues

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Kargianis asked if any members of the public had any comments they would like to provide the committee. No public comments were given. Chairman Kargianis turned the meeting over to Mike Cummings, WSDOT, for presentations.

### **PROGRAM UPDATE**

Mr. Cummings updated the committee on a recent schedule change. The FHWA has decided that the I-405 program will be used as a model for future corridor studies. Therefore, the FHWA has requested a revision of the cumulative impact portion of the DEIS – they are uncomfortable with the current methodology. The team will be updating and editing the DEIS which will now be released in mid-August. The local FHWA representative has been working hard on the issue and the schedule will not be further impacted more than necessary. Mr. Cummings noted that Kim Farley, WSDOT, has also been working on this issue, as well as environmental issues in general.

Senator Horn asked what the issue was for the revision in methodology. Mr. Cummings said “cumulative impact” refers to how the project fits into the region as a whole and how it fits into other past, present and future transportation investments for the region. It also addresses how the project adds to other developments in the area. Chairman Kargianis asked if the program's cumulative impacts take Trans-Lake into account. Mr. Cummings confirmed that it does. Sonny Putter asked if the program is using the Destination 2030 as the basis for this analysis. Mr. Cummings said they were.

Mr. Cummings said the committee would be able to start working on preferred alternative development activities before all public comment is received. Once the public comments have been collected on the DEIS the committees will make recommendations. However, he warned that the current schedule is optimistic and the final decision may be moved further back than November.

The next Executive Meeting is scheduled for August 16.

Mr. Cummings gave an overview of the upcoming Speakers Bureau events:

- Renton Highland Community Association – June 28
- Newcastle Chamber of Commerce – July 25
- Kennydale Neighborhood Association – July 25
- Seashore is scheduled but not confirmed.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Recommendation Process. The program is currently in the System Level Decision phase.

Mr. Cummings gave an update on the activities the Outreach Working Group has been working on:

- Invitation to meet with 1000 Friends of Washington and Transportation Choices Coalition board members sent in early June.
- Meeting set for:
  - July 10, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
  - Lane Powell, US Bank Center
  - 1420 Fifth Avenue, #4100
  - Seattle, WA
- Proposed agenda: Opportunity to discuss issues and concerns, share information, and establish open communication channels.

Mr. Cummings encouraged committee members to participate in the outreach efforts. Mr. Putter said the Outreach Subcommittee would like a chance to clarify program components and objections that seem to be misunderstood by the above groups. Chairman Kargianis asked if the groups' invitations were in response to the subcommittee's proactive letter. Mr. Cummings confirmed they were.

Chairman Kargianis asked if they were becoming involved early enough to make a difference on the groups' decisions. Mr. Putter responded that he hoped they were and saw no harm in trying. Mr. Cummings added the groups have requested a meeting with staff, too, in an effort to bring people in to look at the program's methodology.

Connie Marshall emphasized that the opposing groups have hired an executive director to try and abolish the project. She believes the groups' major objections are to the program's proposed general purpose traffic lanes. The groups are trying to fight the process. Senator Horn confirmed that the group has issued a memo stating they want to "kill the project." Chairman Kargianis said it's important to try and have a meaningful exchange with all groups.

Joan McBride congratulated Mr. Putter regarding the subcommittee's approach. She believes the efforts will help the program and its communication with the public.

Mr. Cummings gave an update on the progress of the Funding and Phasing Subcommittee, which included:

- Developing key message for use in:
  - 1 to 2 page handout and
  - 10 minute presentation
- Organizing partners to deliver messages
- Will be meeting with community groups
  - Business
  - Environmental
  - User Groups (freight)
  - Government (Legislature, Governor, etc.)

Mr. Cummings noted that an Op Ed article has run in the Eastside Journal that was sponsored by some subcommittee members. They hope to run one in the Seattle

Times, too. He encouraged members to contact Paul Bergman with the names of organizations they would like to meet with.

Mr. Putter said the Funding and Phasing Subcommittee Chairman Rob McKenna addressed the funding question in their last meeting. The group suggests outreach be undertaken with legislators to emphasize the need to fund I-405 program solutions. Program staff will be making preliminary talking points and discussing the issue further to develop an approach.

Senator Horn said legislature has already identified I-405 as a possible project.

Mr. Putter said they also want to emphasize the high importance of the Viaduct and "regionalism." He is hoping they can persuade Seattle legislators to advocate I-405 as a "high level" project that needs to be acted upon immediately.

Aubrey Davis said a representative for Mayor Schell said Seattle wants to support funding for Trans-Lake. Mr. Putter said the subcommittee would like to make Seattle advocates of the program before July 16. This way the committee can impress upon the leadership of the House and Governor the emergency nature of the projects. The subcommittee staff will begin development of materials shortly.

Senator Horn suggested that the subcommittee's proposed efforts are valuable but that the project hasn't had much support in the House from either the Democrats or Republicans. He suggested the subcommittee go to the House first and then to the governor.

Senator Horn emphasized the need for a common approach. He said that eastern Washington has a different level of funding than the Puget Sound. Mr. Putter asked if at minimum there has to be a state package? Senator Horn said there has to be a regional package first. Mr. Putter asked if one of the key messages for the legislature should be that a regional package has to come first. Senator Horn said yes.

Barbara Cothorn said concentrating on this might divert attention from the real issue of getting project funding in general. Chairman Kargianis said that the emphasis should be on an emergency or regional package or else they might create more resistance. A meeting with the legislature could be set up where they can reiterate their solutions.

Mr. Putter emphasized the desire for a Seattle outreach effort by July 16 via a letter or summary to district representatives. Senator Horn argued that Seattle was not the priority. Mr. Putter said they will make an attempt but it will not be a primary focus. He would just like to spark discussion.

Chairman Kargianis suggested that this issue be the topic of its own meeting for funding and phasing subcommittee.

### **BNSF RIGHT-OF-WAY PRESERVATION**

Mr. Cummings discussed the latest news surrounding BNSF right-of-way preservation issue:

- Renton requested that its portion of the BNSF corridor be removed from the preliminary preferred alternative.
- Issue was referred from the Executive Committee to the Steering Committee.

- Steering Committee discussed the topic at their June 12 meeting and made a recommendation.
- Citizen Committee requested opportunity to discuss issue on June 21.

The Steering Committee is recommending the following regarding the BNSF preservation:

- Consensus to leave element in PPA;
- Record Renton's objections;
- PMT will modify outreach materials to highlight Renton's objection to element; and
- PMT will provide more information on possible impacts of HCT alignment on I-405 through Renton

Randy Corman clarified Renton's objection to the BNSF preservation while Sandra Meyer passed out overhead photos of where the BNSF runs through the city. Mr. Corman said that the project was gaining steady support in Renton when it concentrated on only I-405. However, since the BNSF has been incorporated into the project, many objections have arisen against it. Before the program goes before voters for funding, Mr. Corman believes it should be more definitive on what the project will actually include. He suggested supplying pictures of how the BNSF will affect Renton neighborhoods. If there is not more clarity on the BNSF, Renton will not likely support the program.

Rosemary Ives asked if the BNSF is currently in use. Mr. Corman said a dinner train currently runs on the line. He said that people are used to the amount of noise from the dinner train but do not want more.

Ms. Ives reiterated that she has concerns about limiting HCT to just the BNSF. The map only refers to BRT but does not note HCT. She believes the BNSF should be kept in the PPA but not be the only HCT option in the area.

The Citizens Committee did not reach a clear consensus regarding the BNSF. The members that wanted the preservation removed had the following concerns:

- Price implications
- Lack of definition creates public anxiety
- Possible impacts on neighborhood with HCT use
- Creates opposition to program

Citizen Committee members that wanted the BNSF retained in the PPA had the following comments:

- Maintains long-range options
- Possible bike/ped use
- Opportunities to better define issue in future (10-15 years)
- Technology could change and have less impacts
- Part of regional planning

Mr. Cummings reminded the committee that the Citizens Committee had not voted to include the BNSF in the PPA. He emphasized that I-405 would carry the majority of BRT system.

Mr. Putter said he thinks it's too early to be taking components out of the PPA. However, Newcastle citizens have said they want to fight funding for an interchange in Port Quendall because of the effect it will have on their city. Mr. Putter emphasized the

need to think regionally. He said the program needs more definition on both the interchange improvements in Port Quendall and usage of the BNSF. The team also needs to first research the efficiency of the improvements. He also emphasized the need to first get through the EIS before making project level decisions.

Senator Horn said they need to separate the BNSF issue from I-405. Work on I-405 needs to be completed before concentrating on the BNSF. He also emphasized the need to shed controversial elements that might hold the program up.

Mr. Putter agreed with focusing on I-405. However, if the BNSF is eliminated, he will be forced to start fighting the Port Quendall project because of concerns expressed by Newcastle citizens. .

Ms. McBride emphasized the BNSF was always included in the corridor study. She agrees with the inclusion and fears that if they don't save the railway now, it will be sold off in parts to different companies. Kirkland has the same concerns as Renton, but they will just have to monitor plans for the BNSF.

Chairman Kargianis said the BNSF should be saved for potential, long-range usage. Mr. Paylor agrees, but does not think it should be preserved at the expense of sacrificing Renton. Every effort should be made to not let this issue detract from the overall goals of the program and coming to regional agreement.

The Executive Committee recommended approval of the Steering Committee's recommendation.

#### **PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

John Shadoff led a discussion on the TDM Program Elements. The elements include:

- Vanpooling
- Public Information, Education and Promotion
- Employer-based programs
- Land use TDM
- Innovative TDM strategies

Mr. Shadoff said they didn't originally include pricing because they wanted to include regional look first. However, he said it is now recommended that pricing be included in each package.

Ms. McBride asked if now is the time to consider TDM pricing. Mr. Cummings said they have been asked to monitor what's going on at the regional level. This will be considered when they are looking at the preferred alternative. He said the PRSC will not have pricing data by the time they get to the preferred alternative, but the team is just trying to keep the committee abreast of issues. Mr. Davis said pricing can't be done project by project – it must be done on a regional level.

Mr. Cummings said managed lanes would be discussed in September.

Chairman Kargianis asked what percentage of the total vanpooling does the van pooling subsidy include? Mr. Shadoff said \$120 million would be subsidized for 2000 vans. They need to rebalance over the next few months because there probably isn't a need for this amount of fare subsidy. Chairman Kargianis asked if there is currently a fare

subsidy in regards to van programs? Mr. Shadoff answered that there is a public subsidy and it is very popular.

Senator Horn asked how many van pools operated in the state. Mr. Shadoff said about 1500.

Mr. Putter inquired about "Land Use TDM." In the handout, Land Use TDM has the most impact in the package of 5 elements. Would the program be better off putting more money into Land Use TDM? Mr. Shadoff said the doubling of funds for Land Use TDM would probably be recommended later. However, its overall effectiveness will probably not be known for 10 years. Mr. Shadoff said there needs to be a combination of TDM and their studies show that the program's current mix is the best. John Okamoto said Land Use as TDM is an issue that's very difficult to sell to the public because the results often take many years to emerge.

Mr. Shadoff said Land Use would be used as incentives. The land developers may be offered tax credits or the state may offer reduced property taxes.

Ms. McBride said she wants to look at doubling the budget because the program is not currently looking into possible pilot projects. She believes smaller towns need support programs. She also believes that funding for pilot programs can go a long way in smaller towns. Mr. Shadoff said the team would try and do some rebalancing. WSDOT currently has \$600,000 in research grants to help smaller jurisdictions in terms of pilot projects. They will be looking to increase TDM land use funds for the I-405 Program.

Ms. McBride asked how much is allotted for non-commute research. Mr. Shadoff said it is still hard to find information on non-commute research. They have a lot of good ideas but not much money. The team will probably suggest more funding for this. Ms. McBride commented that she supports these kinds of innovative projects.

Following are the results of the scenario tested for the pricing of Alternative 1:

- Increase cost of driving – adds about \$0.20 - \$0.25 per mile (High gas tax? Mileage charge?)
- Vary by time of day and congestion levels
- Potential effect on vehicle miles of travel – up to 15% reduction on a daily basis

Following is the TDM Budget Breakdown by Element:

- Core Program – 4%
- Vanpooling – 35%
- Public Information and Education – 8%
- Employer-Based Strategies – 40%
- Land Use – 5%
- Other TDM Programs – 8%

The Steering and Citizen Committees offered the following feedback regarding TDM:

- To whom is the program accountable? – How would the TDM Steering Committee operate?
- Resources needed on local level to implement programs
- Further define "transit-friendly" development and criteria for measuring its success.
- Use on-going evaluations to target funds to most effective programs

- How do we ensure that the non-capital portions of the TDM Program get funded?
- Do we really need to buy vans for the vanpools and subsidize the fares 50%?
- If disincentives are needed, what is the mechanism for having them considered?
- Increase funding for non-work trips?
- Ensure adequate funding for “missing-links”

Mr. Samdahl went over the transit elements of the preliminary preferred alternative:

- Transit System Characteristics
- Transit system by area (north, central, south)
- Park-and-Ride

The following include Steering and Citizen Committee feedback per location:

**North Corridor Feedback:**

- How will BRT serve the UW Campus area, particularly at NE 195<sup>th</sup>?
- Add transit center for Woodinville
- Use BNSF alignment through Kirkland for BRT?

Ms. Marshall said she would like more buses, as much as TDM. She emphasized the need to have a complete package that would reach growth management goals. She would like the program to be as aggressive as possible regarding buses.

Ms. Cothorn said she would like to look at transit center at SR 527 near Mill Creek.

Ms. Ives asked how movement and time is effected by the project and does it consider only one facility servicing the university instead of two? Mr. Paylor said Sound Transit wants to establish a park-and-ride on the university campus but the only option for this would be in wetlands. Mr. Samdahl said they are looking at only one stop for the area.

Johannes Kurz argued for not implementing a park-and-ride lot on I-5/405.

**Central Corridor Feedback:**

- How would BRT connection be handled at NE 85<sup>th</sup> St?
- Match transit system concept to Bellevue Transit Plan
- Further define ‘Core HCT’

Mr. Putter questioned the BRT location in Factoria. He said that the park and ride on 112<sup>th</sup> is underutilized and asked if there may be a better location for BRT than Coal Creek Parkway. Mr. Putter requested more definition on the Newcastle Center/Factoria area center. He also said that Newcastle is currently adding a transit center in the downtown area that needs to be added to the project map. He suggested looking at SR 520 movements too.

Ms. Marshall supported Mr. Putter’s concern regarding the BRT location in Factoria. She would like direct access to the transit facility at 112<sup>th</sup> or Factoria.

Ms. McBride asked if the 70<sup>th</sup> park and ride was an expansion. Mr. Samdahl said it hasn’t been targeted for expansion, which would be the next level.



Ms. Ives asked why there wasn't an arrow on the map in the NE quadrant by the SR 520/I-405 intersection. Mr. Samdahl said according to projections, there isn't a demand for high HOV/transit service in that corner. He said they could probably add something there but they need to be careful of how they handle major freeways. Ms. Davis said Trans-Lake was having trouble coming up with a design that could handle all the interchange movements in the area. Mr. Cummings said the initial concepts will provide for future additions but the team has only costed out three legs of the interchange so far. Ms. Ives said this particular section of I-405 is the widest in the corridor and there is always a tremendous amount of backup in the west to north movement. Mr. Samdahl said the team would look into this.

Mr. Corman asked if there has been analysis regarding Issaquah's traffic and if it contributes to the corridor. Mr. Samdahl said the whole region was modeled but they do not have numbers specifically regarding Issaquah.

Ms. Cothorn noted that the arrows on the printed map differed from those on the overhead map in some areas. Mr. Samdahl said this problem would be corrected.

**South Corridor Feedback:**

- Describe BRT concept through downtown Renton; what are travel time implications; do all the buses need to stop?
- Add BRT/HOV connection to Tukwila commuter rail station (note: this has been completed)
- Better define BRT system on SR 167

Mr. Putter asked where the Renton Highland to Port Quendall to Seattle BRT noted in the mailed handout would originate. He noted that Renton Highlands is a low-density area and does not think it will support BRT.

Ms. McBride encouraged the committee to take a look at a BRT article featured in *City and County Magazine*, which she believes to be quite good.

Mr. Samdahl reviewed HOV usage projections:

- Before 2020, peak hour HOV 2+ demand will exceed capacity of a single HOV lane.
- HOV 3+ volumes will be less than capacity in all sections, leaving spare capacity for transit.
- Highest demand from Bellevue south.

The Steering and Citizen Committees had the following comments regarding HOV Usage:

- How would BRT function within HOV lane?
- Is there enough exclusivity for transit? Is barrier separation needed?
- Possibility of phased implementation to 3+: Could allow for 2+ in non-peak hours initially
- How would a managed lane concept affect the BRT concept?

Chairman Kargianis asked if 3+ HOV lanes would be phased in over time. Mr. Samdahl said it possibly could.

Ms. Ives asked if the team is suggesting a second HOV lane for I-405. Mr. Samdahl said not at this time. Ms. Ives responded that her experience is that 2+ works just as well as 3+. She said having to pick up a third person seems a lot harder than picking up just one more passenger. She suggested that the success and feasibility of 3+ might be unrealistic.

Ms. McBride said the current chart implied that transit wouldn't work with 2+ HOV lanes. Chairman Kargianis said he does not want to dedicate an entire HOV lane to exclusively to transit. Mr. Samdahl said they could consider phase options – during peak hours, the lanes will be 2+ and during off-peak hours the lanes will be 3+.

Ms. Ives argued that, currently, there is an inconsistency between SR 520 and I-405 in regards to HOV lanes. She emphasized that they need to have a holistic approach; that the road systems need to be consistent in choosing either 2+ or 3+.

Chairman Kargianis pointed out that HOV lane enforcement is the problem.

Ms. McBride requested research showing when 3+ lanes would need to be phased in.

Mr. Putter asked if the team should be looking beyond capital towards operating costs. Mr. Samdahl said they have already been looking at maintenance and operational costs and will provide these numbers. Mr. Cummings said they are starting to refine the projections.

Vice-chair McKenna said he would like to see more van pools because they are very cost effective at moving people compared with light rail. Chairman Kargianis agreed that the public has a lot of enthusiasm for van pools.

Mr. Cummings adjourned the meeting at 11:16 a.m.

